



## CALIFORNIA STATE PERSONNEL BOARD

GRAY DAVIS, Governor

801 Capitol Mall • Sacramento, California 95814 • [www.spb.ca.gov](http://www.spb.ca.gov)



DATE: June 18, 2002

TO: ALL STATE AGENCIES AND EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS

SUBJECT: HEARING ON THE STATUS OF THE STATE'S DECENTRALIZED TESTING PROGRAM

In compliance with a resolution adopted September 7, 2001, by the five-member State Personnel Board (the Board), entitled, *To Promote Sound Testing Practices*, the State Personnel Board (SPB) will hold a public hearing on July 9, 2002, to consider the staff's report on *The Status of the State's Decentralized Testing Program: Preliminary Findings and Recommendations*. The hearing will be held at 3:15 p.m., in Room 150, at the State Personnel Board, 801 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California 95814. Those interested in providing oral testimony regarding the preliminary findings and recommendations outlined in the staff's report should notify Shelley Langan, Policy Division, at (916) 654-8538, by July 8, 2002. Those wishing to provide written testimony may submit their comments to Ms. Langan at the above address; written testimony should be received by close-of-business on July 8, 2002.

The Board resolution called for a comprehensive review and evaluation of the State's decentralized testing program, as well as a public hearing to solicit comments and input from program stakeholders. SPB staff has completed a comprehensive review of the program and issued preliminary findings and recommendations for comment at the above-noted public hearing. Preliminary findings to-date concluded that the State's decentralized testing program could be improved. A series of program improvement recommendations has been issued by SPB staff. Attached is an Executive Summary of the report of the preliminary findings and recommendations. Interested parties may access and download the complete report on SPB's Web site at [www.spb.ca.gov](http://www.spb.ca.gov). A limited number of printed copies of the report are available from the SPB's Policy Division. To request a copy, call (916) 654-8538. In addition, a limited number of copies will be available at the hearing. Following the hearing, SPB staff will prepare a final report and recommendations for consideration by the Board. The Board will then issue final recommendations relative to the Decentralized Testing Program.

Questions regarding this matter may be directed to Shelley Langan, Manager, Special Projects, Policy Division, at (916) 654-8538.

Walter Vaughn  
Executive Officer

Attachment

# ***Executive Summary***

**State of California**

---

## **The Status of the State's Decentralized Testing Program: Preliminary Findings and Recommendations**

---

**Prepared by**

**Policy Division  
State Personnel Board**

**June 2002**



# **The Status of the State's Decentralized Testing Program**

## ***Preliminary Findings and Recommendations***

### **Purpose of Report**

Article VII of the California Constitution requires that all appointments and promotions in the State civil service be made on the basis of merit ascertained by competitive examination, making the State's selection system a merit-based system. The Constitution further requires that the State Personnel Board (SPB) oversee the State's selection system and enforce the civil service laws to ensure compliance with the merit principle. The State's selection system encompasses a myriad of selection functions, including recruitment and advertising, testing for the establishment of eligible lists, hiring interviews, background/reference checks, medical evaluation, drug testing, psychological screening, and civil service probation. Currently, the State's selection system is decentralized and provides for individual State departments and agencies, under the authority and oversight of the SPB, to administer their own selection processes, inclusive of initial recruitment and advertising efforts, testing for eligible list establishment, effecting hiring decisions, and administering civil service probationary periods.

One aspect of the State's selection system is the decentralized testing program, whereby State departments and agencies have delegated authority to conduct formal examination processes, including both the development and the administration of those processes. The decentralized testing program encompasses testing for all civil service classifications, including Career Executive Assignment (CEA) positions, as well as testing and selection decisions made pursuant to Board-approved demonstration projects. Decentralized employment testing was originally implemented within State service on a pilot basis in 1981, and was fully implemented in the early 1990s.

Since its inception, no formal comprehensive review has been undertaken to evaluate the effectiveness of the decentralized testing program. To the extent that problematic testing procedures or practices may be utilized, the effectiveness of the decentralized testing program to identify qualified candidates for employment may be compromised. Without a systemic program review, the effectiveness of the



State's decentralized testing program is unknown.

In September 2001, the five-member State Personnel Board (Board) adopted a resolution calling for a comprehensive review and evaluation of the State's decentralized testing program, as well as a public hearing to solicit comments and input from program stakeholders. In addition, the resolution called for Board adoption of findings and recommendations identified through the review process. SPB staff has completed a comprehensive review of the State's decentralized testing program. The review focused on decentralized examination processes conducted for eligible list creation for civil service classifications. Examination processes conducted for demonstration projects and Career Executive Assignment appointments were not included in this review. In addition, while assessment components such as hiring interviews, psychological screening, background interviews, drug testing, and medical examinations are part of the merit selection process, these were not elements addressed in this study. This report documents the review process and outlines preliminary findings and recommendations in preparation for the public hearing.

## **Background of the State's Decentralized Testing Program**

A number of laws and rules establish the State's civil service and corresponding selection system. Article VII, Section 1(b), of the California Constitution requires that appointments and promotions in the State's civil service be made on the basis of merit ascertained by competitive examination. Government Code Section 18500(c)(2) requires that appointments and promotions be based upon merit and the fitness of the candidate as determined through competitive examination. Government Code Section 18930 requires that such competitive examinations fairly test and determine the qualifications, fitness, and ability of candidates to perform the duties of the classification to which they seek appointment. Government Code Sections 18950 and 18951 require that positions in the civil service be filled by the best-qualified candidates and that advancement in State service be based upon merit and ability. To this end, the State's civil service system is a merit-based system that utilizes formal employment testing procedures as one component of the overall hiring process to assess candidate qualifications for purposes of identifying those candidates best qualified for appointment.

Under current rules, the State's selection system provides for decentralized employment testing by State departments and agencies under the authority and oversight of the SPB. Decentralized employment testing was originally implemented within State service in 1981. Prior to the implementation of the decentralized testing program, employment testing for the State's civil service was conducted on a centralized basis by the SPB. Under provisions of the centralized testing program, the SPB was responsible for developing all examination processes, and the SPB shared administration of these centrally developed examination processes with State departments and agencies under provisions of the SPB-implemented Delegated Testing Program. The Delegated Testing Program provided for the delegation of examination administration activities only to State departments and agencies on an examination-by-examination basis, with strict SPB pre-approval and rigid procedural oversight requirements. The Delegated Testing Program allowed for departments and agencies to administer under the close scrutiny of the SPB, SPB-developed examination processes.

In August 1979, the Little Hoover Commission published a report on the Personnel Management System in State service. A major concern discussed in the report was the fact that the centralized employment testing program was not meeting the needs

of State service. The centralized system, including delegated testing provisions in place, was noted as being complex, rigid, and protracted. In follow-up documentation, a 1980 report sanctioned by the Joint Legislative Audit Committee, and conducted by the consulting firm of Ralph Anderson and Associates, stated that through the decentralization of the testing process from the SPB to State departments, a more effective use of resources and significant improvements in testing could be achieved. As noted in the report, decentralized testing activities included both examination development and administration activities, and decentralization of both activities was advocated in the report. As a result of findings in the Little Hoover Commission report, recommendations in the Ralph Anderson and Associates report, and a subsequent study conducted by a task force of SPB staff, a pilot decentralized testing program was conducted.

Under the pilot decentralized testing program, examination planning, development, and administration activities were delegated to State departments and agencies. Participating departments were responsible for all phases of the examination process resulting in the establishment of eligible lists, including examination planning, development of individual selection instruments, examination bulletin preparation, application review, examination administration, scoring, documentation, and records retention. The pilot program called for the SPB to establish standards and guidelines by which departments and agencies would be required to conduct their examination activities. The SPB was also called upon to develop and provide training to departmental staff engaged in conducting examination activities, as well as provide consultative assistance to departments to ensure the development and administration of merit-based examination processes. The SPB also developed processes to monitor and review the results of the pilot program to ensure that decentralized examination processes were merit-based and resulted in the identification of individuals eligible for appointment on the basis of job-related assessment. The pilot decentralized testing program began on April 1, 1981, and included the participation of the Franchise Tax Board and the Departments of Motor Vehicles, General Services, and the Youth Authority.

The pilot program implementation methodology included the selection of departmental participants that were representative of the State's geographic diversity and widely diverse job classifications. Those departments selected also had to express a willingness to pursue the development and use of fair, merit-based examination processes. Based upon departmental staff expertise and corresponding training needs, the SPB developed and conducted training for departmental staff to ensure that staff were adequately educated on a variety of assessment-related topics. Topics addressed in the training included the principles of the State's merit system; the importance of job-relatedness in selection activities;

strengths and weaknesses of various testing procedures (e.g., written examinations, interviews); examination statistics and their uses in assessment activities; and, the implications and requirements of the *Uniform Guidelines*. The training was intended to provide departmental staff with the expertise and resources needed to effectively conduct required testing activities under the parameters of decentralized testing. Further, the implementation methodology called for considerable consultation and oversight of departmental testing activities by SPB staff. During the pilot program, for all decentralized testing processes, SPB staff reviewed examination planning efforts and the examination bulletin prior to its release. In addition to pre-review activities, SPB staff also were available to provide consultation and guidance to departmental staff on a variety of issues and matters related to the development and administration of decentralized testing processes. The final element in the implementation methodology entailed the SPB conducting post-administration audits of the decentralized testing processes. The post-administration audits consisted of a structured review of all aspects of the testing process, including examination planning, test development, recruitment and publicity efforts, application review activities, the appropriateness of testing instruments used, examination security efforts, and the certification of eligible candidates.

In reports to the Legislature in December 1981, and February 1982, documenting the results of the pilot decentralized testing program, the SPB concluded that the pilot program had been successful. Of primary note was the fact that the selected departments could administer examination processes on a decentralized basis significantly faster with no increase in costs than equivalent examination processes could be administered through the State's centralized testing program. Based on the success of the pilot program, the SPB's reports recommended that decentralization be expanded to other State departments. The SPB's recommendation called for the utilization of a structured implementation methodology, modeled after that which was used in the pilot program. The expanded implementation methodology called for the SPB to provide extensive training and consultation to the departments engaged in decentralized testing activities. The methodology also required departments to complete a probationary period during which the department's decentralized testing processes would be thoroughly evaluated by SPB staff. In addition, the SPB reports noted that not all examination processes were suitable for decentralization and, therefore, recommended that testing for large, servicewide classifications remain centralized within the SPB.

As a result of the pilot program and the SPB's 1981 and 1982 reports to the Legislature, plans to expand the decentralized testing program were developed by the SPB in early 1982. Under expansion plans, it was intended that decentralized

testing authority would be extended on a voluntary basis to a minimum of six departments/agencies annually until such time as most departments/agencies were participants in the decentralized testing program. Noted exceptions to participation in the program included small departments and those departments and agencies that declined to participate. It was anticipated that a structured implementation methodology as outlined in the pilot program reports would be used to expand the decentralized testing program. Further, program expansion plans indicated that SPB staff who had previously been engaged in conducting centralized testing for classifications that would eventually be decentralized should be transitioned to those departments which would assume decentralized testing authority. It was anticipated that existing resources would simply be reallocated from the SPB to decentralized testing departments; no reduction nor expansion in resources was anticipated.

In September 1982, Assembly Bill 3332, which had been passed by the Legislature, was signed into law. AB 3332 formally institutionalized the wide-scale implementation of decentralized testing to departments that were interested and qualified to conduct testing processes. AB 3332 called for the SPB to “authorize or assess the ability of appointing powers to design, announce, or administer designated examinations for the establishment of employment lists...” by January 1, 1987. Per AB 3332 and implementation activities already underway, the SPB continued expansion of the decentralized testing program throughout the State, adhering to the recommended implementation methodology discussed above, including the one-year probationary period, to ensure the appropriate training and performance of departmental participants in the program. In addition, the SPB notified departments that upon completion of the one-year probationary period, staff resources commensurate with the reduction in centralized examining services and decentralized testing oversight would be deleted from the SPB's budget and made available for allocation to departments. Throughout expansion efforts, the SPB retained testing authority for servicewide classifications.

In 1985, implementation of the decentralized testing program was accelerated from the January 1, 1987, date stipulated in AB 3332 to June 30, 1985, with the objective being to implement decentralized testing in most State departments and agencies. The SPB hastened implementation of the decentralized testing program in the State's civil service, with the exception of testing for large, servicewide classifications, which was maintained on a centralized basis under the SPB. Due to the acceleration of implementation and the volume of departments newly enrolled in the decentralized testing program, the SPB was unable to provide the degree of training and oversight to departments as had been recommended in the implementation methodology. In addition, budget constraints precluded the reallocation of SPB staff resources to the decentralized departments. Thus,



departments were afforded decentralized testing authority without the benefit of adequate staffing and staff training and preparation, as well as SPB staff oversight and guidance. Further, the one-year probationary period was in essence eliminated from the implementation process.

In July 1987, subsequent to the accelerated 1985 decentralized testing implementation efforts, the SPB authorized departments with decentralized testing authority to conduct promotional testing for servicewide classifications, with the SPB retaining authority for open testing for servicewide classifications. In the early 1990s, the SPB suffered funding cuts, necessitating that open testing for servicewide classifications, which had yet to be decentralized, be decentralized to State departments.

In 1999, some funding for centralized testing was restored to the SPB, enabling the SPB to conduct minimal testing for servicewide classifications. At present, the SPB conducts approximately 11 servicewide examination processes annually, which equates to approximately 0.3% of the State's total annual examining for the civil service. The remaining testing for the civil service is conducted on a decentralized basis by individual State departments and agencies. The SPB is available on a reimbursable, contractual basis to assist departments in the development and administration of testing processes; however, the SPB's role in reimbursable testing activities is minimal compared to the amount of testing conducted for State service.

## Project Methodology

Since its inception, no formal evaluation of the State's decentralized testing program has been conducted. Absent a systemic program review, the effectiveness of decentralized testing is unknown. To determine the effectiveness of the decentralized testing program within State service, a comprehensive evaluation was conducted by SPB staff. The goals of the evaluation were to identify any deficiencies or problems with the program, as well as to identify the positive attributes of the program. The review process focused on examination processes conducted for civil service classifications, excluding CEA examinations demonstration projects.

Departmental testing processes and practices were evaluated to determine the extent to which legal and professional standards and principles were emulated. The evaluation included a review of the decentralized testing program in terms of the degree to which departmental testing practices adhered to State law and regulations pertaining to employment testing practices and recognized legal and professional testing standards and principles, including the *Uniform Guidelines*, the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1991, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the American Psychological Association, Division 14, *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures* (1987), and the American Psychological Association *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (1999). In addition, program performance was compared to findings and recommendations in the professional literature. A growing body of professional literature (see for example *The Validity and Utility of Selection Methods in Personnel Psychology: Practical and Theoretical Implications of 85 Years of Research Findings* (Schmidt and Hunter, 1998) and *Beyond Employment Interview Validity: A Comprehensive Narrative Review of Recent Research and Trends over Time* (Posthuma, Morgeson, and Campion, 2002) demonstrates that the job-relatedness and predictive value of personnel selection practices are maximized when highly structured and standardized assessment techniques are used.

The evaluation methodology consisted of the following data collection elements:

1. A review of the professional literature to identify research findings on decentralized testing practices within the human resources discipline

2. A survey of other state governments with merit-based civil service systems to determine the extent of decentralized testing practices
3. A review of audit findings by the SPB's Quality Assurance unit to identify common issues and/or patterns of quality deficiencies or efficiencies in decentralized testing processes currently developed and administered by State departments
4. A review of examination appeal data to identify trends and/or common issues in appeals resulting from decentralized testing processes currently developed and administered by State departments
5. The dissemination of a comprehensive questionnaire to all State departments engaged in decentralized testing activities to solicit data on testing practices, staff development, and resources required to implement decentralized testing
6. Interviews with personnel officers and/or examination managers in a sampling of small, medium, and large departments to solicit data and comments on departmental decentralized testing practices and the status of the decentralized testing program
7. Interviews with union representatives to solicit data and comments on the State's decentralized testing program
8. Interviews with employee advocacy group representatives to solicit data and comments on the State's decentralized testing program
9. An audit of a sample of decentralized testing processes to determine the quality, soundness, job-relatedness, and fairness of the processes
10. A cost comparison of decentralized testing efforts versus centralized testing efforts

## **Summary of Preliminary Findings and Discussion**

The following section of this report will discuss in detail the results and findings of the data collection activities documented herein.

Based upon thorough analysis of the data collected to date for this project, a host of issues related to the merit and efficiency of the State's decentralized testing program have emerged. While the data collection elements were pursued as independent variables, many common issues and concerns were obtained from multiple data sources. The most frequently cited efficiencies of the State's decentralized testing program include the frequency and timeliness with which departments can conduct decentralized testing processes, the geographically localized testing efforts that departments can conduct to meet specific departmental selection needs, and the familiarity of departmental examination staff with specific departmental selection needs.

A number of issues and concerns with the State's decentralized testing program were noted by many of the program stakeholders interviewed, as well as being manifest in the data collected by project staff. In considering the thematic content of the issues and concerns raised, a number of common deficiencies with the program were identified through multiple data sources. The most commonly cited deficiencies were related to the quality of the testing processes conducted under the decentralized testing program. The union and employee advocacy group stakeholders cited the following as the primary program deficiencies:

- Favoritism and pre-selection in hires and appointments
- Favoritism and pre-selection in examination processes
- Lack of structure in examination interviews (i.e., interviews administered as a component in the civil service examination process as opposed to hiring interviews), including the use of non-job-related questions in the interview, the reliance on subjective, non-job-related scoring criteria, the use of non-expert interview panel members, and the use of panel members familiar with candidates
- Lack of testing expertise of some departmental examination staff

- Lack of adequate communication with candidates, including a lack of notification of examination activities, failure to provide feedback to candidates participating in examination processes, and failure to notify candidates when they are reachable on eligible lists

Many of the above-noted deficiencies are consistent with the issues and deficiencies noted by the United States Merit Systems Protection Board in its reviews of the Federal government's decentralized testing program, as well as those noted by several of the State government representatives contacted for data collection purposes. Additionally, data collected by means of the departmental questionnaire, the departmental interviews, and the review of the decentralized testing processes revealed similar findings.

Several additional program deficiencies were noted in the data collected from the review of the actual decentralized testing processes. In general, decentralized testing processes fail to use highly structured and standardized assessment techniques. The most serious deficiency identified is the lack of job-relatedness of many of the testing processes. A large majority of decentralized testing processes are not based on job analyses which meet the job analytic requirements set forth by the *Uniform Guidelines*, nor do these processes demonstrate evidence of validity (i.e., documented evidence of a relationship between test performance and job performance). The absence of sufficient job analytic data and corresponding validation evidence is observed in all types of testing components, including written examinations, examination interviews, performance tests, and application screening processes. This tends to be the case regardless of department size. In addition, administration of a number of the testing processes resulted in adverse impact against one or more candidate groups. In reviewing available data, it was noted that administration of 15 of the processes resulted in adverse impact. Of those 15 occurrences of adverse impact, seven occurrences (47%) could be defended on the basis of business necessity, as those seven examinations had validation evidence documenting their job-relatedness. The examination processes in the other eight occurrences had not been validated nor developed based upon job analysis, and, therefore, conclusions about whether the content of the examination processes was related to business necessity could not be determined.

Another noted deficiency is the lack of job-related pass points used for written examinations and examination interview processes. The majority of pass points reviewed fail to demonstrate that the standard of candidate performance which signified minimal acceptable competency was related to acceptable levels of job performance. The failure to utilize job-related pass points is evidenced in departments of all sizes, although large departments are more likely to rely on job-

related pass points for written examinations than are medium or small departments. Numerous deficiencies were noted in the examination interview process, which comprises more than 50 percent of the examining that occurs in the State's selection system. Documented deficiencies discussed herein occurred in a number of examination interview processes regardless of department size, examination base (e.g., open, promotional), and/or job level.

Further analysis of the data indicated that these deficiencies represent failings of decentralized testing processes to adhere to recognized assessment standards and principles, including the *Uniform Guidelines*, the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1991, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures*, and the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*, as well as professional literature. Of further note is the lack of clarity in current State law, rules, and regulations pertaining to the specific design and development of employment testing processes and individual selection instruments. Thus, while legal and professional standards and principles may delineate sound selection, greater specificity in State law, rules, and regulations would help to assure professional excellence in the State's selection system.

An additional issue which was raised by the union and employee advocacy group stakeholders was the perception that candidates may not exercise their right to appeal examinations for fear of reprisal. No additional data corroborating this sentiment emerged via any of the other data collection elements, and the large number of appeals filed would tend to disprove this perception. However, without further study, the issue of reprisal or retaliation can not adequately be addressed.

A recurrent complaint of the decentralized testing program was directed at the quality of support and consultation provided by the SPB. The complaints focused on the frequency with which conflicting information is provided by SPB staff in response to queries from various stakeholders, including departmental examination staff, State employees, examination candidates, and union/employee advocacy group representatives. Data collected regarding this issue indicates that the conflicting information frequently requires departments to defend their actions to one SPB function based upon direction provided by another SPB function. It was stated by numerous stakeholders that in its role as overseer of the decentralized testing program, the SPB needs to provide consistent interpretation of policies, rules, and regulations, as well as provide departments with a single set of expectations for conducting decentralized testing activities.

While a number of deficiencies were noted in the decentralized testing program and actual decentralized testing processes, there was evidence that departments are

conducting sound testing processes in some instances. However, the severity of the deficiencies noted in many departmental testing processes and practices serves to adversely affect the value of the State's selection system. Many of these deficiencies are not necessarily a result of decentralized testing but, rather, a result of poor testing practices, untrained staff, and a failure of departmental leadership to value to role of testing in the State's merit-based selection system. An analysis of the data indicated that those departments which have most prevalently utilized the SPB's Selection Analyst Training Program for examination staff training conduct higher quality, better job-related testing processes than do those departments whose staff have received less training or no training through the program. Data collected indicates that large departments and small departments have a greater number of examination staff who have completed the training program curriculum. In addition, the primary reasons cited by departments as affecting the degree of staff participation in the training program are insufficient financial resources and staff availability to attend.

Data collection efforts also focused on identifying program improvements. A multitude of suggestions were provided by various program stakeholders. The most commonly cited improvements involve the role of the SPB in the decentralized testing program. Departments called for revisions to the SPB's *Selection Manual* and on-line examination scoring system, as well as greater customer service and support from SPB staff. Union and advocacy groups called for the SPB to play a greater role in overseeing decentralized testing activities.

Based upon data collection and analysis efforts to-date, a series of recommendations for improving the quality and soundness of the State's decentralized testing program have been developed. The recommended program improvements have been identified as means to improve the State's selection system and provide for increased merit, efficiency, and effectiveness in the testing program. The recommendations are presented in the next section of this report.

The final report for this project will include additional findings and discussion, as necessary, based upon the results of the cost comparison data collection activity currently underway and the July 2002 Board Hearing.



## Recommendations

The following section of this report will outline staff recommendations based upon the results and findings of the data analysis process documented herein.

An analysis of the State's Decentralized Testing Program resulted in the emergence of a number of program deficiencies which threaten to seriously compromise the quality and effectiveness of the examination processes conducted for the establishment of eligible lists. The thematic content of the program weaknesses identified involves a failure to utilize soundly developed, job-related selection procedures, inclusive of structured, standardized scoring criteria and job-related pass points. To mitigate deficiencies in the Decentralized Testing Program and to ensure continued fairness and effectiveness in the State's merit-based selection system and departmental decentralized testing efforts, the following program recommendations are made:

1. The SPB shall promulgate rules and regulations requiring that all civil service examination processes, inclusive of each individual selection component comprising the processes, be based upon current job analytic data and validated according to provisions outlined in the *Uniform Guidelines*. The use of job analytic data, as well as the presence of validation evidence, will ensure that such examination processes and individual examination components are job-related, predictive of candidate job performance, and defensible under federal guidelines, statutes, and case law.
2. The SPB shall promulgate rules and regulations specifically requiring that all selection procedures (e.g., written examinations, interviews, performance tests, evaluations of experience, education, and training) used in civil service examination processes be developed, administered, and scored according to professionally recognized standards and principles, as outlined in the *Uniform Guidelines*, the *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures*, and the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*, to ensure that candidate qualifications are adequately measured against standardized job-related criteria.
3. The SPB shall establish minimum standards pertaining to decentralized testing activities to ensure that decentralized testing processes result in merit-based,



job-related assessments of candidate qualifications. Such standards shall address departmental staffing levels, expertise and training requirements for staff, and required documentation for examination processes to ensure that decentralized testing processes are soundly conducted.

4. Departmental examination staff shall be fully trained and competent to develop and administer valid, merit-based examination processes, as defined in the *Uniform Guidelines*, the *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures*, and the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*. Therefore, to ensure adequate staff training and expertise, completion of the State's Selection Analyst Training Program (or a similarly approved program) shall be mandatory for all examination analysts, supervisors, and managers within one year of appointment to a position responsible for the completion of examination development and/or administration activities.
5. The SPB shall pursue staffing and budget augmentation to provide a greater level of expert consultative support to departments engaged in decentralized testing to ensure that departmental examination staff have access to expert resources in the field of employment testing.
6. The SPB shall pursue staffing and budget augmentation to establish an ongoing monitoring and review program for decentralized testing. Such oversight will ensure that departmental testing programs adhere to the SPB's established standards for decentralized testing and follow professionally accepted principles for the development and administration of valid, merit-based examination processes, as outlined in the *Uniform Guidelines*, the *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures*, and the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*.
7. The SPB shall pursue staffing and budget augmentation to provide for more frequent and in-depth quality assurance audits of departmental decentralized testing processes to ensure that decentralized testing processes are valid, job-related, and comprised of instruments that will adequately measure the KSAs to be assessed, as well as administered fairly and consistently.
8. The SPB shall promulgate rules and regulations requiring that all pass points utilized in selection instruments and selection processes be based upon a job-related rationale that identifies the level of candidate competence required for job success, as provided for in professional standards and guidelines, such as the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* and the *Uniform Guidelines*.

9. The SPB shall pursue rule changes to require the use of current job analytic data as the basis for determining job-related qualifications to assess in examination processes, rather than perpetuating the currently mandated use of classification specifications, to ensure that those standards against which candidate qualifications are measured are reflective of current job requirements.
10. The SPB shall pursue staffing and budget augmentation to offer the Selection Analyst Training Program on a no-fee basis to departmental examination staff to maximize course availability and ensure that departmental examination staff are afforded adequate access to the program regardless of individual departmental budget constraints.
11. The SPB shall expedite revisions to the *Selection Manual* to ensure that current expectations and requirements for conducting decentralized testing processes are provided to departments.
12. The SPB shall review and revise the *Selection Manual* on a frequent basis to ensure that expectations and requirements for conducting decentralized testing processes are appropriate based upon current legal standards and professional principles in the assessment profession.
13. The SPB shall ensure that consultative information and direction provided to customers is accurate and in accordance with current rules and regulations, as well as current professional practices related specifically to employment testing.
14. The SPB's on-line examination scoring system should be updated or modified as necessary to allow for adequate support and processing of examination activities.
15. The SPB shall expedite revisions to the *Chairing Interview Examinations* course offered through its Technical Training Program to reflect current professionally recognized interviewing techniques to ensure that interview panel chairpersons are trained to fairly and objectively administer interview examinations.
16. The SPB shall offer the revised *Chairing Interview Examinations* course on a no-fee basis to departmental examination staff who completed the course currently offered within the past three years. Further, the SPB should offer half-day sessions highlighting the revisions to the *Chairing Interview Examinations* course on a no-fee basis to all currently certified interview chairpersons.

17. Where a department or agency fails to adhere to the SPB's established standards for decentralized testing and/or fails to follow professionally accepted principles for the development and administration of valid, merit-based examination processes, as outlined in the *Uniform Guidelines*, the *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures*, and the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* such that departmental testing efforts result in habitually substandard examining, the SPB shall mandate required improvements and monitor the department's testing program. In the event that the department/agency's testing program fails to incorporate the required program improvements, the SPB will consider lessening the department/agency's testing authority until such time as the testing program meets established standards. Such restrictions could include reducing departmental testing authority to allow for the administration of delegated testing only or the complete withdrawal of decentralized testing authority from the department/agency.
18. The SPB shall work with departments to identify strategies to eliminate duplicative departmental testing efforts for servicewide and multidepartmental classifications, as well as provide for similar testing processes to be used across multiple departments for servicewide and multidepartmental classifications. Strategies explored could include joint promotional testing efforts by multiple departments utilizing a centrally developed testing process which could be administered by departments and would result in multiple departmental-specific eligible lists.
19. The SPB should pursue staffing and budget augmentation to develop and offer additional assessment-related training courses addressing advanced assessment principles and concepts to ensure that departmental staff are afforded opportunity to stay apprised of legal and professional advances in the field of assessment.

The final report for this project will include any additional recommendations based upon data resulting from the cost comparison data collection currently underway and the July 2002 Board Hearing.